United Nations A/C.1/55/PV.26

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

First Committee
26th meeting
Tuesday, 31 October 2000, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: U Mya Than ..... (Myanmar)

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

Agenda items 65 to 81 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: As I mentioned at the Committee's meeting yesterday, Monday, 30 October 2000, the Committee will continue to take decisions on the draft resolutions that appear in information working paper No.5/Rev.1 in the following sequence: in cluster 1, nuclear weapons, draft resolutions A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1; in cluster 2, other weapons of mass destruction, draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42; and in cluster 10, international security, draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1. In addition, if there is no objection, the Committee will also take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.28, on small arms, because an oral statement on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is now ready to be made.

I call now on those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Mr. Čalovski (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): In introducing draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1, I should like to make a brief statement.

We have made three changes to draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1. In the ninth preambular paragraph we have added a reference to the Skopje statement so that the paragraph will read as follows:

"*Noting also* the importance of the Charter of good-neighbourly relations, stability, security and cooperation in South-Eastern Europe signed by the participating States of SEECP in Bucharest on 12 February 2000 and the Joint Statement of the Heads of State and Government adopted in Skopje on 25 October 2000".

In the tenth preambular paragraph we have deleted the word "outcome" so that the paragraph would read,

"*Noting further* the Conference on War-Affected Children held in Winnipeg on 17 September 2000".

In operative paragraph 7 the word "bilateral" has been deleted, so that the paragraph will now read,

"*Stresses* the importance of regional efforts aimed at preventing conflicts endangering the maintenance of international peace and security, and *notes* with satisfaction, in this regard, the role of the Multinational Peace Force for South-Eastern Europe".

The adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1 by the First Committee at this time carries special significance. The third preambular paragraph welcomes the democratic changes in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and their positive effects on the peace, stability and development of South-Eastern Europe. It is the first time that the General Assembly will have formally done so. I am pleased to note that the fundamental democratic

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

00-71829 (E)

changes in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia have resulted in the submission of an application for the admission of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the United Nations, an event that will take place today and tomorrow.

I wish to stress that the region of South-Eastern Europe is entering a new period of integration with developed Europe and leaving behind the period of conflict, insecurity and underdevelopment. The adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1 will strengthen this process. In this new period for our region, disarmament and arms control efforts and efforts to eliminate illegal trafficking in small arms and light weapons I am sure will be more successful than has been the case in the past. The adoption of this draft resolution will mean that the principle of good-neighbourliness and mutual respect will dominate in relations and cooperation among all countries in South-Eastern Europe.

I should like to take this opportunity to thank all sponsors for their sponsorship and for their participation in the preparation of the draft resolution. I should also like to thank all delegations to the First Committee for their support, readiness and willingness to promote the aspirations of South-Eastern European countries, which is very important at this moment.

Mr. Alborzi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have asked for the floor to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, entitled "Missiles".

Since the submission of this draft resolution, my delegation has conducted extensive consultations on its content. Various suggestions and proposals were made during those consultations which were intended to bring new elements to or further elaborate on some of the concepts in the draft. We highly commend all those efforts, and I acknowledge the importance and relevance of the suggestions. The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran is aware of the complex nature of the issue of missiles, which, to a certain extent, is difficult to compare with any other field of disarmament and arms regulation because of its sensitivity in the context of the national security of States. Therefore, the presentation of this draft resolution to the General Assembly should be viewed as an agent to build upon the minimum required common denominator among the different approaches involved.

Last year, when we started our efforts to initiate a basis on which to commence multilateral intergovernmental discussions on the issue of missiles, we anticipated that it would not be an easy way to go. We soon further realized that it was much more complex than could be seen at the first stage. All this has brought us to the question of why this significant issue of disarmament and arms control has remained dormant and outside the realm of the United Nations, where it truly belongs.

Our extensive consultations with various countries and groups of countries, both at the United Nations and in capitals, revealed the cold facts that several States occupying a significant position in regional and international peace and security, in particular those with access to technology and those who either maintained or envisaged a system of missiles in their broader military and security strategies, had solidly entrenched positions with little room for flexibility. The arguments raised, we should admit, in most cases were convincingly strong and difficult to disregard. Our delegation, however, was required to work to achieve a basic minimum out of some deeply opposing views throughout the past month and in the course of this session of the General Assembly. We are aware that some countries would still prefer to have their views included.

Some strongly believe that the principle of non-discrimination should be further highlighted and the existing deployments should be taken into account. Others wish to view the draft resolution and the panel of experts as a multilateral means to effectively address the issue of non-proliferation of ballistic missiles. The prevailing view was, however, that neither should be overemphasized at the expense of the other and that both should be maintained as positions of principle through which a reasonable approach could emerge.

Iran is not fully satisfied with the result since it was our desire to accommodate as many views as possible, especially because most of them were also in line with our national position. We are, in the meantime, pleased to have been able to encompass the concerns, at least in a general manner.

The revised text of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1 contains two new elements which are also the product of our consultations with Member States and with the Secretariat. The first is for the Secretariat to further seek the views of Member States.

That could provide an opportunity for more States to submit their views to the United Nations. It was also suggested that the expert group should submit its report in two years' time instead of one year's time in order to enable the Secretariat to better organize the sessions of the panel. These two issues are duly addressed in the revised text of the draft resolution.

The draft resolution provides a general framework for opening a multilateral dialogue on the issue. The Iranian delegation hopes that the establishment of the panel of governmental experts will receive the highest degree of support from States and the Secretary-General. We are confident that interested countries with decisive views will have an outstanding opportunity to express them to the expert group which is to study the issue of missiles in all its aspects.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, nuclear weapons, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1. I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I should like to state China's position on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, entitled "Missiles". In recent years the question of missiles has caused increasingly wide concern and requires serious treatment by the international community. We believe that since this question is so complicated and involves so many factors it cannot possibly be effectively addressed through any unilateral approach or measure detrimental to global strategic stability. Discriminatory measures taken by groups cannot fundamentally solve this question either, although they may ease some problems in the short term. We believe that in order to settle this question appropriately it is necessary to promote the establishment of a fair and reasonable new political order, reject the practice of power politics and the abuse of power, and further strengthen regional and international security so that all countries can have a sense of security.

At the same time, it is necessary to establish a universal and non-discriminatory global multilateral mechanism through widespread international dialogue and cooperation, first of all to address the issue of missiles in all its aspects fairly and comprehensively.

We believe that draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1 represents a constructive effort in this direction. We are in favour of the proposal contained in the draft resolution that a panel of governmental experts be established on the basis of equitable geographical distribution to discuss the question of missiles. Therefore, China will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): It is my honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as Iceland and Norway, as countries of the European Free Trade Association and members of the European Economic Area, associate themselves with this explanation of vote.

The European Union fully acknowledges the importance of the question of non-proliferation of missiles. While understanding the general approach taken by the draft resolution, we find that it is too vague on the critical subject: the proliferation of missiles and missile-related technology. The European Union has therefore decided to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

Nevertheless, the European Union emphasizes the need to step up international efforts to prevent the spread of missiles and missile-related technologies. Inter alia, the draft code of conduct recently adopted in Helsinki will have a role to play here. The member States of the European Union therefore hope to participate fully in the panel of experts to be established in order to uphold the principles and objectives that it supports.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, entitled "Missiles", in order to clarify certain points on this issue.

First, Egypt proceeds from the premise that this question must be considered comprehensively within the framework of the consideration of weapons of mass destruction. Secondly, dialogue on missiles must be totally non-discriminatory and take all elements into account without focusing only on aspects of non-discrimination and non-proliferation. Thirdly, we hope that the Iranian draft resolution will be a positive first

step in this dialogue. The content of the draft resolution is positive and contributes to disarmament efforts. Therefore, Egypt will vote in favour of the draft resolution out of our concern to advance disarmament efforts, in particular those aimed at eliminating weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems.

Mr. Luck (Australia): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, on the subject of missiles.

Australia agrees that the issue of missiles warrants international and United Nations attention and welcomes Iran's interest in the matter, as shown by its sponsorship of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1. In particular, we note with interest the proposal for the formation of a panel of experts to report to the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session on missile issues.

Australia has been active in pursuing measures to reduce the proliferation of missiles and looks forward to being able to contribute to these efforts in a range of bodies. Regrettably, however, Australia continues to have a number of substantive difficulties with this draft resolution, which means that we will abstain again this year. These difficulties have more to do with what the draft resolution omits than what it addresses. For example, all States would recognize that the proliferation of ballistic missile technology and the development by more countries of increasingly longer-range ballistic missiles is of grave international concern. Ballistic missile proliferation, and particularly long-range ballistic missile proliferation, destabilizes both regional and global security. Like many others we find it difficult to support a draft resolution on the issue of missiles "in all its aspects" which does not make any mention of the increasing rate of ballistic missile proliferation and the need to address it.

The reference to the need for "a comprehensive approach towards missiles, in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner" could be interpreted as ignoring the valuable contribution made by the missile technology control regime to missile non-proliferation efforts. Australia is a strong supporter of the missile technology control regime, the objective of which is to inhibit and prevent destabilizing transfers of ballistic missile technology.

Finally, to return to the question of a panel of experts, Australia believes that should such a panel be created by this draft resolution, it should concentrate on the issue of analysing and reducing ballistic missile proliferation, in particular of long-range ballistic missiles. The panel would require adequate time to examine the question of missiles, and for that reason we support the timing of reporting to the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session. We look forward to making a constructive contribution to this exercise should it go ahead.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): The draft resolution introduced by the representative of Iran on the issue of missiles represents a very important initiative which the Pakistan delegation has strongly supported from the outset. We wish that the draft resolution could have reflected with greater precision and detail some of the factual problems and issues that surround the question of missiles in the present-day context.

First, we had hoped that the draft resolution would acknowledge that the central security danger posed by missiles arises from the existing deployment of thousands of missiles equipped with nuclear weapons by some of the major Powers.

Secondly, we had hoped that concern would be expressed at the unilateral and discriminatory measures that are at present maintained by certain States in the context of missiles. Reference has been made here to the so-called MTCR — Missile Technology Control Regime. Pakistan considers this scheme to be highly discriminatory against the developing countries. States that reserve the right to maintain and deploy thousands of missiles themselves, are now promoting the concept of missile non-proliferation and thus seeking to deny developing countries the legitimate means for self-defence. That is totally unjustified. Unless we oppose discriminatory regimes such as the MTCR, there is likely to be a proliferation, yes, but a proliferation of discrimination.

We hear talk of the emergence of an aircraft technology control regime. Soon we will hear of the emergence of an information technology control regime, and thereafter, no doubt, a regime for the control of brain power will also emerge as a means of further increasing the gap in security between the developed and the developing countries.

The international community must resolutely resist this discriminatory trend, and we hope that in the further work on this issue, the question of discrimination, which has been projected here and

elsewhere as a problem of non-proliferation, connoting the attitude of apartheid in security, will be opposed, at least by the developing countries.

We welcome the opportunity, which the adoption of this draft resolution will present, to open a multilateral dialogue involving all interested States in order to evolve equitable, non-discriminatory and universally accepted agreements and norms on the issue of missiles. We take note that operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1 states that the panel should include experts on the basis of equitable geographical distribution. We trust that the panel will include experts from all interested States. In the past there was a tendency to invite experts only from countries that voted in favour of resolutions setting up such panels. We note that now some of those countries want to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution but still insist on their membership of the panel that is to be established.

Finally, there is one important concept that does not find adequate reflection in the draft resolution, and that is the need to promote the peaceful uses of the technologies involved. In our world today some countries have the power to reach outer space while others are not even allowed to use firecrackers. This situation must change, and we hope that this draft resolution and the expert discussion that it will initiate will allow the evolution of greater equity in the field of missiles.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, entitled "Missiles", was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the Committee's 26th meeting, on 31 October 2000.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, "Missiles", I wish to put on record the following statement on financial implications, on behalf of the Secretary-General:

> "By operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a panel of governmental experts, to be established in 2001 on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, to prepare a report for the consideration of the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session on the issue of missiles in all its aspects.
>
> "It is envisaged that the panel of experts would hold its sessions in New York according to the following schedule: one session in 2001, two sessions in 2002. The conference-servicing requirements at full cost are estimated to be US$ 91,900 in 2001.
>
> "With regard to sessions to be held in 2001, the extent to which the Organization's capacity would need to be supplemented by temporary assistance resources can be determined only in the light of the calendar of conferences and meetings for the biennium 2000-2001. However, provision is made under section 2, "General Assembly affairs and conference services", of the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001, not only for meetings programmed at the time of budget preparation but also for meetings authorized subsequently, provided that the number and distribution of meetings is consistent with the pattern of meetings of past years. Consequently, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution in question, no additional appropriation would be required for conference servicing in the biennium 2000-2001.
>
> "The conference-servicing requirements for the sessions to be held in 2002 would be considered in the context of the preparation of the Secretary-General's proposed programme budget for the biennium 2002-2003. Provisions have been made under section 4, "Disarmament", of the programme budget for the 2000-2001 biennium which would allow the Department for Disarmament Affairs to provide the necessary substantive services to the session of the proposed panel of experts to be held in New York in 2001.
>
> "Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1 was adopted by 90 votes to none, with 60 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): The United States understands the sentiment behind the draft resolution but continues to believe that it is unnecessary and counter-productive to bring this discussion into the United Nations. Accordingly, the United States abstained.

The problems of missile proliferation are well known, and ongoing international efforts already exist to limit missile proliferation. The call for a different multinational approach is unnecessary and counter-productive. The responses received by the Secretary-General thus far do not indicate that there is sufficient agreement in the international community to merit convening a panel of experts. Until more States respond, and until the specific views of the international community become clearer, a panel of experts could do more harm than good. The United States Government takes this view not because we believe there is no problem with missile proliferation. Quite the contrary: the United States takes the danger of missile proliferation very seriously and has been an active participant in seeking to limit it. In practice, the international community's most effective efforts have been on a regional basis and involve the States directly interested and affected. The United States plans to continue its efforts to address the problems posed by missile proliferation and will focus on strengthening and reinforcing those efforts. We encourage other concerned States to cooperate in this common cause and not to act in ways that would undermine it or divert attention and resources from it.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I have asked for the floor to explain the position of my Government on the draft resolution on missiles, contained in document A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1.

The proliferation of missiles as delivery vehicles for weapons of mass destruction is a matter of concern to Japan, which, for its part, has been making efforts for the non-proliferation of these missiles. My delegation, however, abstained in the voting on this draft resolution since it does not make explicit reference either to the concern about the proliferation of missiles as delivery vehicles for weapons of mass destruction or to recognition of the efforts being made in which my country participates. Regardless of how

we vote, we remain committed to the goal of the non-proliferation of such missiles and to playing an active role in preventing and curbing their proliferation.

Mr. Chang (Republic of Korea): My delegation wishes to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1. The proliferation of missiles as a means to deliver weapons of mass destruction seriously undermines international peace and security. In particular, the test firings conducted in some regions over recent years have provided an urgent reason for the international community to address the issue of the proliferation of ballistic missiles. Given the complexities inherent in this issue, we believe that a step-by-step approach would be most practical. We note that the international community has made various efforts to resolve this issue at the bilateral and multilateral levels, and we encourage their further development. My delegation, however, is of the view that this draft resolution fails to address these points properly. Therefore, my delegation abstained.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution.

Mr. Kim Won Myong (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to express its views on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1.

The Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba, establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones that cover the southern hemisphere, contribute to a great extent to a nuclear-weapon-free world. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea highly values these achievements and appreciates the efforts made by the countries of the regions concerned. We agree that it is imperative to ensure in practical terms and further consolidate the legal status of these nuclear-weapon-free zones by fully meeting the request and desire of countries in those regions. We do not see any reason, in view of the commitment made by the nuclear-weapon States concerned, for the request of the countries not to be met. It is also hoped that such nuclear-weapon-free zones will be expanded to other regions.

Ms. Menéndez (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation is taking the floor in order to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". My delegation intends to abstain in the voting.

Spain fully supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. It is our view, in this respect, that the draft resolution before us, "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", is important for the consolidation of such zones and cooperation among them. In the past my delegation supported the content of such resolutions, casting a vote in favour in 1998 and 1999. This time, however, because of the incorporation of a new operative paragraph 6, on the content of which we have reservations, my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1.

Resolution 53/77 Q of 1998, resolution 54/54 L of 1999 and draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 contain in their preambular paragraphs reference to the possibility of, among other types of exchanges, joint meetings of States parties and signatories to treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones, the objective being that of fostering cooperation among such areas. My delegation has no objection to that concept. However, the text to be put to the vote this year introduces a qualitatively different new concept in operative paragraph 6 — that of a possible international conference — and this also entails, in our view, a departure from the consensuses recently reached with regard to nuclear-weapon-free zones. Indeed, the concept of a possible international conference such as that outlined in operative paragraph 6 has not been mentioned at any previous time — not in the report submitted by the Disarmament Commission in April 1999 on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, and not in the paragraphs on nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Spain actively participated in both negotiations and welcomes the fact that in both, satisfactory consensus outcomes were arrived at, although with difficulty. It is our view that the groundwork we have laid in both documents is adequate and further juridical or political elements that might warrant holding the kind of international conference that is being proposed in operative paragraph 6 are not needed. Therefore, my delegation finds itself unable to endorse such a

proposal and is consequently unable to support this draft resolution.

Mr. Sorreta (Philippines): The Philippines wishes to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. The Philippines will vote in favour of the draft resolution because it contains elements that the Philippines feels are very worthy of our support. The Philippines was among those who strongly supported and co-sponsored such a resolution when it first came out, during the fifty-first session. However, subsequent versions of the resolution have included language that refers to a right of a passage through maritime space, forcing the Philippines to withdraw its co-sponsorship of the draft resolution.

In the context of a nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere the language on freedom of passage could only refer to the passage of ships carrying nuclear weapons through the high seas and maritime space. The Philippines understands and appreciates that this language was included because of the desire of the principal proponent of the draft resolution to gather more support. However, this language does not and will not contribute to the realization of the objectives of this draft resolution, and will in the long run prove to make that realization even more difficult. Just as we believe that States cannot transport weapons of mass destruction through the high seas and maritime space, the Philippines believes that nuclear weapons should be treated no differently. In our written and oral pleadings during the hearings on the advisory opinion on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons* we emphasized our belief that nuclear weapons are illegal, wherever they may be. We reiterated that position when we sought to include nuclear weapons, which are clearly indiscriminate and cause unnecessary harm and suffering, as a prohibited weapon in the Statute of the International Criminal Court. For the Philippines, which is composed of quite a lot of maritime space, this prohibition finds form and substance in our Constitution, which does not allow the presence of nuclear weapons on our lands or in our maritime space.

Political realities have conjured up the legal fiction of the non-illegality of nuclear weapons. Those political realities are changing and hopefully will lead to the absence of nuclear weapons in both hemispheres.

Mr. Soutar (United Kingdom): I have asked for the floor on behalf of France, the United States and the United Kingdom to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, on the so-called nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas. Our three delegations will again vote against this draft resolution. Last year we worked hard with the sponsors of the resolution in an ultimately futile attempt to allay our concerns about their seeming desire to restrict maritime rights of free passage on the high seas. Unfortunately, the sponsors refused to include in the draft resolution the applicable passages of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, as well as explicit reassurance that the fundamental freedom of the seas was to be unaffected by their intentions.

Our concerns have increased this year. A Minister from one of the sponsor countries has made it clear that it is his intention precisely to limit freedom of the high seas in ways that fundamentally undermine the norms set by the Convention on the Law of the Sea. We are also concerned by the new language in this year's draft resolution referring to an international conference of States parties and signatories to nuclear-weapon-free zones. It is not clear what that conference is meant to achieve, and under the circumstances I have already described we can only fear the worst. The United Nations, moreover, agreed on general guidelines for nuclear-weapon-free zones at the United Nations Disarmament Commission session of 1999, and we do not see how this conference can contribute anything further.

Lastly, without any clear intention of the purpose of the international conference and how it is meant to relate to the relevant legal instruments and accepted international norms, it appears to us as if the sponsors were on an exploratory expedition that may well be unhelpful to our overall interests. We should all consider the consequences carefully.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. A separate vote on the last three words of operative paragraph 3 has been requested, and a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 has been requested.

There will therefore be three steps to the voting. First, the Committee will vote on the last three words of operative paragraph 3 of A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. Secondly, the Committee will vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. Finally, the Committee will vote on A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 as a whole.

The Committee will now take a decision on the last three words of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the Committee's 25th meeting, on 30 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 are listed in the draft resolution itself. In addition, Ghana has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Committee will now vote on the last three words of operative paragraph 3, which read "and South Asia".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Cuba, Cyprus, Israel, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Myanmar, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The last three words of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 were retained by 134 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Botswana informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

"3. *Welcomes* the steps taken to conclude further nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, and calls upon all States to consider all relevant proposals, including those reflected in its resolutions on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East and South Asia".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia,

Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Cyprus, Israel, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of) Myanmar, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 was retained by 138 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Botswana informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Monaco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, India, Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), Russian Federation, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 146 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

The Chairman: I call now on those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes.

Mr. Mukul (India): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its vote with regard to operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", which refers to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. This proposal goes contrary to a well-established principle regarding the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zone: that these zones must be established on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. The United Nations Disarmament Commission last year reaffirmed this principle by consensus. There is thus a contradiction in operative paragraph 3.

That contradiction becomes even more apparent when the reference to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia is seen in the context of current realities. In fact, if the sponsors of this draft resolution wish to maintain any semblance of relationship to reality, the draft resolution should explore ways and means of relating nuclear-weapon-free zones in the southern hemisphere to the new realities in South Asia.

India will be responsive to the expressed need for commitments from these nuclear-weapon-free zones. As we have stated in the past, the proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia has as much validity as proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones in East Asia, Western Europe, or North America. Given the distortions and contradictions in operative paragraph 3, we voted against the paragraph while abstaining in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China is always in favour of and supports the efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. On the basis of this position, China has signed and ratified the relevant protocols to nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties for Latin America, Africa and the South Pacific, and to the Antarctic Treaty. China is willing to sign as early as possible the revised protocol to the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty in accordance with the programme agreed by South-East Asian countries. China believes that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is of great significance for the promotion of nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the enhancement of world and regional peace and security. At the same time, nuclear-weapon-free zones should be established in accordance with the provisions and principles of the United Nations Charter and the universally acknowledged principles of international law.

The scope of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should not include continental shelves and exclusive economic zones, nor should it include areas in which there are disputes over territorial sovereignty and maritime rights and interests with countries outside the zone. The participants in a nuclear-weapon-free zone should not use any pretext, including a relationship with a military alliance, to avoid fulfilling their relevant obligations.

The Chinese delegation has noticed that the draft resolution just adopted on a nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas refers to the applicable principles and rules of international law relating to the freedom of the high seas and the right of passage through maritime space, including those of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It is our understanding that the draft resolution does not seek to add any new legal obligation to those contained in the relevant nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties. On the basis of this position and this understanding, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". My delegation's conviction is that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones contributes positively to the goals of nuclear disarmament. They are effective confidence-building measures. That is why my delegation considers that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in any part of the world could be helpful. That is why it also welcomed the opportunity to include the last three words of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will now turn to cluster 2. I call first on those delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 2, other weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): It is my honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union regarding draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction". The countries of Eastern and Central Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries of Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as Iceland, a European Free Trade Association country and member of the European Economic Area, associate themselves with this statement. The members of the European Union fully support draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42 put forward by Hungary.

The European Union attaches high priority to the strengthening of the 1972 Convention on the prohibition of biological and toxin weapons. The fulfilment of that objective depends on the conclusion of negotiations within the special group of parties to the Convention on a legally binding protocol establishing a regime of verification and control. The European Union is continuing its efforts to advance the successful outcome of those negotiations so that the protocol can be adopted as soon as possible by a special conference of parties to the Convention to be held before the Fifth Review Conference of the Convention. The European Union invites all States parties to become involved in these efforts.

The member States of the European Union are actively participating in the negotiations of the special group. They reaffirmed their continuing commitment by establishing on 17 May 1999 a common position regarding the progress to be made in order to conclude the protocol. The measures contained in that common position are designed to provide a balance between the needs of verification and respect for the economic and commercial interests of States parties. In terms of security, they can provide significant guarantees, which today are lacking. The European Union believes that the establishment of a regime of verification and control for the 1972 Convention, made possible through the adoption of the protocol in 2001, will soon be added to the steps made in the past 10 years in the area of nuclear, chemical and conventional disarmament.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42. If no delegations wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors: Cuba and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The programme budget implications for the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/55/L.54, "Note by the Secretariat concerning the responsibilities entrusted to the Secretary-General under draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42".

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, we shall turn now to cluster 4. I call first on delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, conventional weapons.

Mr. Sorreta (Philippines): The Philippines places the highest importance on the small arms conference to be held next year, and we are very glad that at this point we know where and when it will be held. For this we wish to express our appreciation for the efforts of the delegation of Japan for allowing us to arrive at this

point and also express our appreciation to the many delegations that cooperated so that we could arrive at this decision. We must also recognize the very generous offer of Switzerland. We know the extent to which it has been helping with the small arms problem, and it has taken the extra step of wanting to host the conference.

As an affected country, the Philippines looks forward to the conference and hopes other issues, such as the chairmanship and the participation of non-governmental organizations, can be resolved by a process that will not affect the two forthcoming preparatory committee meetings, because our preference is that the Preparatory Committee meetings should deal with the substantive issues, and issues such as the chairmanship and the participation of non-governmental organizations could be dealt with positively in an inter-sessional informal way.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): I should like, on behalf of the European Union, to make the following statement regarding draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1. The countries of Eastern and Central Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries of Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as Norway and Iceland as European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area, associate themselves with this declaration.

The European Union welcomes the offer made by the Government of Switzerland to hold the 2001 Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects in Geneva. In particular, we welcome the willingness of the Swiss Government to allow, thanks to generous funding, the participation of the greatest possible number of delegations, in particular experts from those countries most affected by the problem of the destabilizing accumulation of small arms. We keenly regret that a few days ago the Swiss authorities were obliged to withdraw their offer, given the impossibility of finding a basis for reasonable agreement with the Secretariat in order to define the supplementary costs resulting from the holding of the United Nations Conference in Geneva. The European Union remains convinced that for the future Geneva must be able to remain a United Nations focal point for disarmament. It will strive to ensure that that status is recognized with all due clarity and transparency.

The European Union hopes that procedural issues will be settled as quickly as possible, and by consensus, in order to continue preparations for the 2001 Conference in the best spirit possible. Today we finally need to turn to issues of substance with the preparation of an international plan of action commensurate with what is now at stake. Let us not forget that the 2001 Conference — and we are gratified that it is able to be held next July — is an important meeting for the international community, in particular for all those suffering from this scourge. The meeting in January of the Preparatory Committee will provide an opportunity to show our capacity to meet their expectations, and, as far as members of the European Union are concerned, we shall give Chairman Carlos Dos Santos all the assistance that he has a right to expect from delegations.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take action on draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1, entitled "Small arms", was introduced by the representative of Japan at the Committee's 25th meeting, on 30 October 2000. The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1 are listed in the draft decision itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft decision: Austria, Brazil, Guinea, Mozambique, Senegal and Uzbekistan.

I wish to make a statement on the conference service implications of draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1. Under the terms of operative paragraph 14 of resolution 54/54 V, which is referred to in the preambular paragraph of draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to carry out a study, with the assistance of governmental experts appointed by him, on the feasibility of restricting the manufacture of and trade in small arms and light weapons. It is envisaged that in 2001 the Group of Governmental Experts on the feasibility study of small arms, will hold a one-week meeting in New York early next year, tentatively from 12 to 16 February 2001.

There will be two meetings per day, a total of 10 meetings, with interpretation service in all six languages Documentation requirements are estimated at 70 pages in session and 40 pages post-session to be processed in six languages. The conference-servicing requirements at full cost are estimated at US$ 193,500 in 2001. The extent to which the Organization's capacity would need to be supplemented by temporary assistance resources can be determined only in the light of the calendar of conferences and meetings for the biennium 2000-2001. However, provision is made under section 2, "General Assembly affairs and conference services", of the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 not only for meetings programmed at the time of budget preparation, but also for meetings authorized subsequently, provided that the number and distribution of meetings is consistent with the pattern of meetings of past years. Consequently, should the General Assembly adopt the draft decision in question, no additional appropriation would be required for conference servicing in the biennium 2000-2001.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position on the draft decision just adopted, the Committee will now move to cluster 10. If no delegations wish to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 10, international security, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1.

If no delegations wish to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution before action is taken, the Committee will take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Maintenance of international security, good-neighbourliness, stability and development of South-Eastern Europe", was introduced by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the Committee's 26th meeting, on 31 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Iceland and Turkey.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
None

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1 was adopted by 150 votes to none.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Reznikov (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): The delegation of Belarus has asked for the floor in order to explain its position and its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Maintenance of international security, good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe".

Our delegation considers this draft to be an unquestionably important example of regional cooperation that reflects the efforts of countries for the development of good-neighbourliness, stability and the development of South-Eastern Europe. But is the subject of the draft resolution within the competence of the First Committee? It is known that in plenary meetings the General Assembly takes decisions on such agenda items in the context of the establishment of long-lasting, stable peace and progress in freedom and democracy in regions such as Central America; of the reasons for conflict and ways to promote and ensure lasting peace and stable development in Africa; and of the establishment of a zone of peace and cooperation in the South Atlantic.

Those are but a few of the agenda items discussed in plenary meetings of the General Assembly that have always found support from our delegation. This draft resolution, in our view, should be considered in the plenary General Assembly. Unquestionably, it contains a number of provisions that touch on questions of disarmament, but that is not its main thrust. We consider, therefore, that it is a more appropriate subject for the plenary Assembly than for the First Committee.

In addition, the draft resolution contains a number of provisions that are a source of concern to my delegation. We reported on this to the sponsors of the draft resolution and expressed our concern well before even the first version of the draft resolution was issued officially, let alone the revised draft resolution. Nevertheless, after revision 1 was issued we saw that none of our views and concerns had been taken into account. Therefore, our delegation maintains certain reservations on the text of the draft and cannot join the consensus on adopting the draft resolution. However, taking into account the constructive and cooperative spirit at this session, and also in the light of the generally positive thrust of the draft resolution, our delegation did not insist on a vote.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1, mindful of its relevance to efforts being made to promote good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe.

Cuba particularly supports the principles to which reference is made in operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of the draft resolution. That does not mean any automatic endorsement by Cuba of each and every one of the elements and approaches embodied in this text. In fact, the draft resolution raises certain issues that, in our view, would require broader consideration than the consideration we in the First Committee could give to them. Among these issues we find, for instance, some that bear on the work done by the United Nations and by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Kosovo. If there is a continuing trend to incorporate in draft resolutions on this subject new elements with broad implications, we would suggest that in future the main sponsors of the draft resolutions consider the possibility that the texts be considered in the plenary General Assembly and not within the First Committee. That would make it possible in turn to consider each and every one of these elements from a far broader and more comprehensive perspective.

The Chairman: The statement of the representative of Botswana has been noted.

Before adjourning the meeting I should like to remind representatives once again that, bearing in mind our aim to finish the work of the Committee, tomorrow, Wednesday, 1 November 2000, there will be only two more meetings in which to act upon the remaining draft resolutions. Tomorrow will be the final day for taking action on the remaining draft resolutions. I therefore urge delegations, particularly the sponsors of the remaining draft resolutions, to get them ready and inform the Secretariat in a timely manner so that the Committee will be able to take action on them on schedule.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to the fact that the note by the Secretariat concerning the responsibilities entrusted to the Secretary-General under draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.50 is contained in document A/C.1/55/L.55, which has been distributed today.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.